

Appl. No. 10/707,803
Amdt. dated August 03, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 12, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments to the Claims

5 Claim 1 is amended to include the limitation of "so that the resistances of the first and second impedances are substantially different from each other," in order to overcome the 102(e) rejection based on Gulati et al., United States Patent Application No. 2003/0146786 A1. The amended claims 1 and 7 are fully supported by the specification. Specifically, please refer to Fig. 2 and paragraph [0023] that state impedances 12 and 18 are of value R_i while impedances 14 and 16 are of value $(R_i (1 + \theta))$, which are
10 **substantially different from each other**. Claim 19 is amended to correct the grammatical error, and claim 20 is amended to correct the typographical error. In addition, a new claim 21, including the above limitation and dependent on claim 7, is entered. No new matter is introduced.

15 Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gulato et al. Pub. No.: US 2003/0146786 A1.

20 Response:

The applicants maintain that Gulati fails to teach or suggest the newly added claim limitation of "so that the resistances of the first and second impedances are substantially different from each other." As stated in the original application as filed, by **controlling the first and second impedances to be different values**, especially when the difference therebetween is small, the

Appl. No. 10/707,803
Amdt. dated August 03, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 12, 2005

underlying circuit benefits from a high input impedance characteristic. Such claim limitations have never been taught in the cited reference of Gulati, and therefore the amended claim 1 has overcome the rejection under 35 USC 102.

- 5 Since amended claim 1 is found allowable, claims 2 – 6 dependent thereupon should also be considered allowable.

Claims 7, and 8 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuttner U.S. patent No. 6,707,405.

10

Response:

The Applicants maintain that Kuttner fails to teach or suggest at least the following claim limitation of “the third input impedance being substantially equivalent to the second input impedance,” as well as “the fourth impedance being substantially equivalent to the first input
15 impedance.” After careful examination of the content of Kuttner, the Applicants are unable to identify any portion of the disclosure that even remotely connects to such claim limitations. Even with the description recited by the Examiner at column 5, lines 46 – 50, Kuttner merely states that “the resistance values of the resistors R6, R7, R8, and R9 correspond with the resistance value of the resistor R4 and the resistor R5.” As to how these resistors R6 – R9
20 correspond with R4 and R5, Kuttner remains silent. In addition, Kuttner merely discloses utilizing switches S6-S9 to control signal paths (col. 5, lines 56-65). There is no disclosure stating that the input impedances are controlled by control signals applied to the switches S6 – S9. In short, Kuttner fails to teach or suggest controlling the input impedances by control signals.

25

Appl. No. 10/707,803
Amdt. dated August 03, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 12, 2005

As a result, the Applicants are reluctant to believe that these claimed limitations are properly anticipated, or made obvious, by Kuttner. Therefore, the independent claim 7 should be considered allowable.

- 5 Since amended claim 7 is found allowable, claims 8 – 11 dependent thereupon should also be considered allowable.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gulati et al. as applied to claim 2 above.

- 10 Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuttner, in view of Gulatio et al. as applied to claim 2 above, in view of Sobel U.S. Patent 6,833,759.

Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuttner, in view of Gulatio et al. as applied to claim 5 above.

- 15 Response:

Since claims 3 – 5 and 12 – 13 are dependent claims of either the independent claim 1 or 7, they should also be considered allowable for at least one of the above detailed reasons.

New claim 21

20

The new claim 21 is a dependent claim of the independent claim 7, so it should be found allowable for at least the same reason claim 7 is being deemed allowable. In addition, claim 21 further recites the limitation of substantially different resistances of the first impedance

Appl. No. 10/707,803
Amdt. dated August 03, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 12, 2005


and the second impedance, which is never taught by any of the cited references.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5 As stated by Examiner in this office action, Claim 14 – 20 are allowed. Since claims 19 & 20 are amended only for grammatical error and typographical error, the amended claims 19 & 20 remain allowable.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

- 10 Sincerely yours,



Date: August 3, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

- 15 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 20 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)